

Agenics

BY M. J. RIORDAN

LATELY we have had eugenics *ad nauseam*. Through skilful advertising, it has become a fetish within the decade, and imperceptibly a crop of allied sciences or fads has sprouted from its root. The ugliest of these scientific offshoots is one that curiously enough, if it reaches maturity, must destroy the parent, since its purpose is not the Pharisaic "quality rather than quantity," but out-and-out nonentity.

This derivative science has not yet risen to the dignity of a specific name. It is known variously as birth-control, eugenic selection, infanticide, or child-murder, according as it is practised by the exclusives, the intellectuals, the depraved, or the Chinese. Now that it has advanced to the point of having open advocates on the lecture platform and in the press, it should have, for the sake of convenience, "a local habitation and a name" in the dictionaries and encyclopedias, and I think no term can label it more accurately as a science than the word "agenics," the science of the deliberate annihilation of human life, the science of the purposely childless wife.

The wilfully childless wife with a dog in her arms is the uttermost symbol of failure. This seems a hard saying when we look out over the mad world strewn with human wreckage, and when we consider that wherever the sun in all its course casts a shadow, those are to be found in plenty who have missed their way in life

through poverty or ill-health or lack of opportunity or defect of ability or some one or other of a thousand misfortunes or through one of the seven deadly sins or a combination of them. And yet no one of these can have failed quite so miserably as the wife who through deliberate will establishes a dumb brute in the affections that were made to cherish a wingless cherub fashioned in the very image of God.

Obviously the failures in life are based on the fact of life; no life—no pain, no sin, no suffering, only nothingness. It is in this case alone—and it is this that makes it the supreme failure—that there is a reaching-out into the mysterious realm that precedes life, to the enactment there, by an act against nature, of a tragedy compared with which other ills are commonplace. In that realm, which is the eternal counsel of God, there are myriad souls awaiting the cooperation of woman for creation and incarnation. She alone can defeat the eternal design of God; she alone can make it effective. It is true that every sin, in its own weak way, blocks the harmonious fulfilment of the plan of the Creator, but the wife who refuses to be God's instrument of life rebels against creation, and that in the face of the transcendent gift of her own creation. Her attitude is, in effect, the appalling one that so far as she is concerned creation shall end with her. She does not will to reject the gift of life for herself; but she decides that the line of life, in so far as it depends upon her, shall come to an abrupt close.

What matters to her the infinite purpose of God or the failure of souls to come into immortal being? A lap-dog satisfies her yearnings for creation and for correspondence with the duty set to her hand by her Lord

and Master. She will not serve; she will not be "the handmaid of the Lord"; she has received her own existence as a pure gift; she will enjoy it while she may, then let the deluge come. Lucifer rebelled against the living God; she rebels against life itself. Lucifer would rule life; she would destroy it. The parallel is terrible, but the fact is more terrible still. No other being beside such a woman can or will dry up and make barren the source of life, and that to no other purpose than that she may riot more abundantly, though it be only the silly riot of idleness and self-indulgence. Such a woman—and can it be said that there are not many of them?—may hang her throat with pearls and circle her fingers with sapphires, her limousine may be fragrant with the breath of orchids, and her drawing-room may be draped with tapestries and inlaid with lapis lazuli; but her spirit is dead and is wrapped in the vesture of the grave, when her face is turned away from the souls that God has assigned her from all eternity to clothe in fair young flesh. An Angel Gabriel is sent her, a wedded wife, "with tidings of great joy," but she rejects him; she will have no part in the incarnation appointed her; there is no "Magnificat" in her heart or on her lips; most lamentably for her, no sword pierces her heart; and though "the wideness of God's mercy" is for her as for all, most lamentable of all her misfortunes, she can never know a Calvary of her own.

The attitude of the modern world toward the wilfully barren wife is amazing. She has come to be looked upon as a rather superior person. She assumes and is encouraged in assuming the patronage of mothers. She is stage-crazy over the latest baby in the block; she adores Mrs. Smith's twins; she simply cannot keep her

hands from off Mary Brown's baby boy; she is Lady Bountiful to the Jones tribe of children, though she does sympathize with Mrs. Jones; she lets it be known that she really would like to have a dear little baby of her own, if a child of hers could possibly have as little sense as her dear Fido. There is no brand on her forehead. Far from it, there is just the suggestion of a crown. She has laid hold of much of the skill of the devil in transforming darkness into light. Her neighbors begin to remark over the pity that such a splendid woman, or lady it will probably be, should be childless. But then it would never do for her to be burdened with family cares since that would mean withdrawal from charitable work and social duties. No, it is too bad that she should have to give up the hope of being a *matrem filiorum latantem*, but she is altogether too important for that. God would have difficulty in handling matters without her unhampered help. Then the poor would miss her so much, and so many young mothers would lack advice, and so many unsophisticated maidens would have no one to tell them "truths" that their foolish mothers withhold from them. On the whole, the poodle is a sign of election in her case and in the cases of innumerable other women of brains and money, particularly the latter; for it is to be noted that the wife childless by design almost invariably belongs to the brainy or wealthy classes; it is the exception to find such women among the ignorant and poor; God's love of His own is wonderful.

And so this woman, who has defied the creative act of God and has been ungrateful for the gift of life, becomes by the ingenuity of her selfish diplomacy, not an outcast and a shame, but an angel of light and healing

to her less fortunate sisters who have not yet learned that child-bearing is indecent among the rich and immoral among the poor.

The steps from praise to envy and from envy to imitation are not steep or far apart. Is the mother of a large family a wooden image that she should not regard with envy the fine gowns of her childless neighbor, and her jewels and motors and massaged cheeks and manicured fingers and her freedom, as of a bird, from petty household duties and her opportunity to entertain at afternoon teas and to shine at evening balls and midnight suppers? Though she indeed prizes her treasure of children, they have cost her anxiety, and pain and deprivation, sleepless nights and busy days, and perhaps hardest of all, they have brought her the contemptuous sympathy of her superior neighbor. Is it any wonder that at times there is just a suggestion in her heart of envy for the wise woman who has known how, and who has dared, to defy the laws of God, and at the same time to establish herself in the front seat before the stage of this world? Then may it not well be that some weak matron will take the plunge from envy into imitation? Thus is the woman who flaunts her Creator made to spread sin and sorrow like a plague among the wholesome members of the community which she infests, while gullible society is in admiration of the dear soul who is so interested in civic welfare, humane treatment of stray cats, and the movement for better babies, and fewer of them.

The selfishness of these women is as monumental as their ingratitude to God. They will have no part in the perpetuation of their species, but they will fight like a tigress for ease, admiration and command, and in the height of their effrontery they attempt to instruct and

criticize, even to pity the noble mothers who are bearing the burdens and the joys of the race. Their effrontery is beyond measure. In so far as it rests with them, human life would cease at their death-bed, and so they would not hesitate to put a final term to the family, to the State, to the Church, to the school, to everything. Yet, through eugenic societies, clubs of various kinds, and incessant personal propaganda, they are eternally regulating the affairs of the good women on whom the Church, the State, the school, and life itself depend. It is sad enough that these women should travel the road to destruction themselves; it is appalling that they should go out into the highways and hedges to compel, as it were, others to join in their unholy pilgrimage.

In Israel of old the barren womb, even when the result of natural causes, was looked upon as a blight and a visitation of God. The hope of a quiver filled with arrows, of a table aglow with children like shoots about the olive tree, of a wife like the fruitful vine on the walls of the house, was the dearest expectation of the Jewish bridegroom and the highest ideal of the Jewish bride. A large family was the blessing of heaven upon a holy union; the lack of it was the sign of a curse upon the door-post.

Thank God, that among the virile Jews of today the tradition of their fathers has not been lost. Thank God, too, that in holy Ireland, with all its suffering and centuries of poverty, its women are still fruitful mothers of men; and the same is true in Poland and in Spain and in South America and in Italy and in parts of Boston, and wherever else the laws of God are "the truth, the light and the way." A blessing is upon them, and in spite of the eugenicists and the sociologists, they

and their children shall, by the promise of God and the workings of His laws, inherit the land. Their rags shall be riches when set side by side with the silks of the deliberately childless wives.

Our Lord uttered a curse upon the irresponsible, barren fig-tree; shall the judgment upon the barren wife, who is so through choice, be less severe? The words of St. Paul to Timothy, "Yet she shall be saved through child-bearing," are the passport to heaven of the wife who is fulfilling the duty of her state in life; they are also the warrant of condemnation of the selfish and cowardly wife who is a wife only in name. The inspired words of St. Paul need enunciation among modern women much more than do the specious vaporings of eugenists or pseudo-scientists. They are the words of the Holy Ghost; the latter are for a great part the maunderings of unclean minds.

In recent years there has been an immense amount of plain speaking and indecent writing in behalf of childless wives and limited families by Malthusianists, eugenists, prophylaxists, birth-controllists, and a host of others of like kidney. They have commandeered the churches, the schools, the press, the theater, the cinema, the lecture platforms and every other possible agency into their service of spreading the gospel of the destruction of the race, until the mass of the people are really coming to believe in and to practise the infamous teachings that have been dinned into their ears and set before their eyes and hammered into their heads so persistently and enthusiastically, and by such ingenious methods as to deceive even the teachers.

The net living result of all this propaganda may, it is true, be summed up in a mongrel parody of Horace's

famous line, *parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus "pup,"* but the result to innumerable souls has been mortal, and the effect on the character of the nation has been evil beyond estimation. But this at least may be said: By reason of the unholy practices developed by these vicious teachers the future American is certain to have more of the blood of the Celt and the Slav and the southern Latin in his veins than of the Puritan or the "high-brow" which in many respects may not be so much of a disaster as some might think.

But the serious thing that these vampires have brought about is the reproach they have succeeded in fastening upon holy motherhood. They have made child-bearing a shame, whereas it is a glory; they have made motherhood—a most sacred state of woman, the state that made the name of Mary the most beloved that has ever been given to a created being—a state to be apologized for, if not subjected to their detestable rules and limitations. It has come to be that the mother of two children is tolerated; the mother of four endured; the mother of six is outside the pale of society; the mother of eight is a nuisance; of ten a calamity and of twelve a brute. The order of God and of normal human beings, of those whose opinions are of the least value, is precisely the reverse in an ascending scale of honor until the mother of twelve assumes the dignity of a queen.

The ostracism of motherhood is a despicable manifestation of brutality under the guise of culture and exclusive knowledge. The strength of this brutal cult of barrenness lies to a large extent in the brazenness of its propaganda. The megaphone has been at its mouth and has drowned out the occasional voice of protest. Then, too, prudery has been its efficient assistant. There

is a wholesome disposition among clean minds to be over-nice and to dread uncleanness where in reality there is none. Hence they have kept quiet through dread of notoriety or of overstepping the bounds of modesty, and a clear field has been left to be sowed with the cockle by an enemy. But the voice of St. Paul is not dead, nor the voices of the Doctors in the Church who have succeeded him. They are only muffled by the clamor of the noisy horde who have been preaching the doctrine of child-prevention and of defiance of God. It is time that these commanding voices should again be heard, and that the words of authority, "Yet she (woman) shall be saved through child-bearing," should be proclaimed anew, and without mincing them, as St. Paul proclaimed them through holy Timothy, the Bishop of Ephesus. Then shall motherhood become once more as it really is, a most glorious and honorable title among the daughters of Eve, and the wilfully childless wife shall take the conspicuous place where she belongs, at the very head of the bitter procession of human failures and outcasts.

Was it not Chesterton who said of eugenics: "It stinks"? By these words he burned an eternal brand of infamy on the unsavory science; at the same time he robbed the language of the only phrase than can fitly describe agenics. The latter brand of human knowledge must now parade the less distinguished heraldic motto: "It's rotten."

The Secularized State

BY THE BISHOP OF NORTHAMPTON

*The Substance of a Paper Read by the Right Rev. Dr.
Keating at Manchester, on the occasion of the Silver
Jubilee of the Local Branch of the Catholic
Truth Society, October 7, 1916.*

JUST before the war, the Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, published a "History of Freedom of Thought," which may be described as a pæan over the alleged downfall of Christianity, not only as a faith, but especially as a social and political force. He proudly reviewed the triumphs of rationalism, particularly German rationalism, in the nineteenth century, showing how the earlier assaults of physical science had been followed up by the still more deadly bombardment of historical criticism, till the whole Christian position had been pounded into a shapeless pulp. On the faith of Haeckel's monistic philosophy, he went on to announce the glorious resurrection of the old pagan ideals of human life, unsullied by the blighting influence of the religion of the Cross, and to prophesy the punctual parousia of the New Era.

Armageddon, with its nightmare of "frightfulness," overwhelmed the Professor and his theories in the ruins of an apostate civilization. Catholics, however, are entitled to repudiate all responsibility for the calamity. For a century past, under the leadership of the Roman

Pontiffs, we have never ceased to protest against the open impiety and the folly of our Age. While other churches temporized, or sought safety in wholesale surrenders, we have always flatly denied that the Holy See can or ought to come to terms with so-called "progress, liberalism, and the new civilization." Hence, the silly parrot-cry that Christianity has been tried and has failed does not worry us. It is not Catholic Christianity that has failed, but those who have forsaken the fountain of living water, and have digged unto themselves broken cisterns which can hold no water.

The fundamental truth, as valid in politics as in theology, is: That God made man to know Him, and to love Him, and to serve Him in this world, and to be happy with Him for ever in the next. Our supernatural destiny is a law in the moral order as indefeasible as gravitation in the physical order. To ignore it, or defy it, is to ensure disaster.

From this fundamental subordination of our natural to our supernatural happiness it follows that our temporal interests are not only consistent with our eternal interests, but that, under normal conditions and in the long run, our temporal interests are dependent upon our eternal interests.

Our temporal interests are the immediate care of the "State," and comprise not only the supply of material goods, but also the moral relations of citizens as husbands and wives, parents and children, buyers and sellers, employers and workmen, and so forth, in so far as these affect public order and the common good. Our eternal interests have been expressly and exclusively committed to the one universal and infallible Church, founded by Jesus Christ Our Saviour, guided by the Holy Ghost,

enriched with the means of grace, and commissioned to teach all nations and to impose the law of the Gospel on every creature.

Both the Church and the State are Divine institutions, for "there is no power but from God, and those that are, are ordained of God." The priest and the prince are each "God's minister to thee for good." Manifestly two such institutions, designed by the same hand, were intended to work together in harmony, like the cog-wheels of a machine, for their mutual advantage and the advantage of their common subjects.

These principles governed the formation of Christendom down to quite recent times. From the Peace of Constantine for many a century onwards rulers and people alike accepted without question the orthodox profession that "before all things it is necessary to uphold the Catholic Faith." They accepted it, not only as a Divine truth and a manifest religious duty, but as a maxim of civil government, upon which the stability of the State itself rested.

The process of secularization dates from the Reformation; a fact which in itself strikingly illustrates our contention that whatever touches the Church reacts upon the State. Even the countries that had thrown off the obedience of Rome never thought for a moment that they could afford to jettison religion as lightly as they had jettisoned the Pope. If the traditional hold on conscience were relinquished, rulers were at a loss to find any sanction strong enough to secure civil allegiance. Hence their hurried adoption of the immoral compromise *cujus regio, illius religio*; and, for a considerable period, this device of State churches, protected by savage laws of uniformity, did actually enable them to stem the ever-rising flood of pure secularism and democracy.

Catholic countries were not altogether free from the taint. But it was in our own country, especially in England, when England was the stronghold of Toryism, that politicians, ecclesiastics, and jurists combined their strength to bolster up a thoroughly Erastian theory of Church and State.

The experiment of State churches at length failed, as it was bound to fail. How could the arch be expected to endure when the keystone had been ruthlessly torn out? The *virus* of unfettered private judgment had infected the life-blood of Protestantism, and needed only time to dissolve its tissues. Nonconformity in worship and radicalism in politics increased and multiplied like bacilli, till, under the outburst of the intellectual activity that marked the nineteenth century, nothing could be done for the old order of things but bury it decently.

It is one thing, however, to recognize the secularization of politics as a sad necessity, a *pis aller* to be turned to the best account; it is quite another thing to belaud it as a glorious achievement, in the way the modern world has done, and to hail it as the palladium of human progress. The difference is far more than a difference of view-point; it reaches down to first principles, and radically divides the false "liberalism" of the day from the sane teaching of the Gospel, meaning liberalism in its scientific sense and not its political meaning in England.

Liberalism of this type can be gauged both by its theory and its practice. Over and above un-Christian legislation in such matters, as marriage, education, and similar institutions of first-rate importance, it has invariably used its opportunity to run an anti-clerical crusade, to confiscate ecclesiastical and charitable funds, and to hamper the Church at every turn in the discharge

of her ministry. The record stands: he who runs may read.

Professor Bury did but set out in the most aggressive and offensive terms the thesis elaborated by our scientists and thinkers, and tacitly assumed by the generality of our journalists and magazine-writers, viz.: That the social and political influence of Christianity, when it has not been negligible, has been always in a retrograde direction. They pillory Christian civilization as a reversion from the higher ideals of pagan civilization. They accuse the Church of having held the human mind in bondage: of having organized opposition to every progressive movement: of having bemused the masses by her dogmas and ritual, and distracted their attention from the urgent reforms of this world by superstitious hopes and fears for the world to come.

Obsessed by the fixed idea of evolution, which they believe to be everywhere operative and everywhere determined by necessary causes; convinced that free will is a myth, and morality a matter of climate, temperament, and hygiene; preoccupied in the investigation of so-called social and political *laws*, to which human life may be adjusted, but from which there is no escape; their hope of the future is limited to some wooden scheme of Socialism or political economy, or more vaguely, to the triumph of free thought. It is sheer folly to talk of coming to terms with liberalism of this type.

When the Peace Congress meets, and the map of Europe is remodeled, the religious problem will be presented to politicians in an acute form. In the Near East, especially, questions of race and nationality will be found to be seriously complicated by questions of creed. The new political entities will comprise cross-groupings of

Jews and Catholics, Uniates and Orthodox, and many smaller sects; all fervently attached to their ancestral faith, and capable of causing trouble to any government that attempts to ride rough-shod over them. Similarly in the West, if Alsace and Lorraine should be assigned to France, the Catholics of these provinces will undoubtedly demand guarantees that they shall not be required to sacrifice, under the rule of our Ally, the liberty and encouragement they enjoyed under the rule of Germany. Thus the future relations of the Church and the secularized State are ripe for discussion, and can be perfectly studied in the lurid light of the war.

(1) The secularized State, for all its undenominational character, should esteem and reverence what we may call "the religious idea." If we have learned anything, we have learned that society will not hold together except by moral ties in addition to material ties; and no moral ties are really effective that have not the sanction of conscience and religious conviction.

(2) Christianity is the prevalent religious faith, however vague and confused, of the European peoples. Therefore the State should be proud to call itself a Christian State, and to mold its legislation according to Christian ideas.

(3) The State must regard freedom of conscience as the most inviolable of rights. Existing for the protection, not only of the rights of the majority, but for the protection of the rights of all, it will recognize that, to vote away the religious liberty of even a small sect is not a constitutional act, but a violation of the Constitution.

(4) Freedom of conscience implies freedom of cult. The State in virtue of its secular character is totally unfitted to direct religious organizations. It should, there-

fore, give absolute liberty to all denominations to manage their own affairs, to own property, to form associations, and to propagate their opinions, without let or hindrance, so far as the State is concerned, provided they do not infringe the equal rights of other bodies.

(4) In dealing with the Catholic Church in particular, the State must recognize that it is dealing with an international body, possessed of its own international organization, and ruled by its own international head, the Roman Pontiff. This indisputable fact governs the situation, and is allied to other facts, equally indisputable, and of no less capital importance: the antiquity of the Church, dating back to the very times of the Apostles; the record of the Church, imbedded in the history of every civilized people: the actual membership of the Church, vastly outnumbering the total of all other Christian bodies; the vitality of the Church, renewing itself from age to age, and manifested in the yearly multiplication of dioceses, religious congregations, and missionary expeditions.

No civil power can ignore the Catholic Church, whether as friend or foe; nor can the aggregate of civil powers afford to ignore him who sits in the chair of Peter, and commands this mighty instrument by a word. Each State, therefore, will consult its own advantage by maintaining formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See; and the Congress of Powers ought not to consider itself complete, or adequate to the great work of reconstruction that lies before it, unless it includes the controller of incomparably the greatest peace organization in the universe.

The Christian State, wrought to perfection by the wisdom and piety of our ancestors, is, nearly everywhere,

a thing of the past; and the factors that could possibly reconstitute it are not visible on our horizon. The secularized State holds the field. It can never rival the achievements of the Christian State; but the frank adoption of such principles as I have indicated would equip it for its most necessary work. One demand, however, we have a plain right to see conceded without any demur: that everywhere and instantly there should be an end to the harrying and plundering and besmirching of our Catholic brethren, which has so long and so sorely distressed us. If proof were needed, religion in the crucible of war has triumphantly satisfied every test of patriotism, heroism, superabundant charity, and social as well as spiritual worth. It has earned the gratitude of nations, and the right to pursue its own ends, unmolested by the malice and vindictiveness of a discredited clique of freethinkers.

The Pan-Protestant Conference

BY THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM T. RUSSEL

WE cannot let pass without some notice the pitiful pretensions of those who assembled at the Panama Conference of the Protestant missionaries for the "discussion of the needs and missions" of the Latin Americans. Out of the overflowing, superabundant treasure-house of Christianity in the United States, what portion, we may ask, are these zealous missionaries disposed to bestow upon the misguided Catholics of Central and South America? Will they teach them Christianity?

It is admitted that the Latin Americans, for the most part, believe at least in Christ.

The northern part of Mexico, which produced the bandits now giving us so much trouble, is the only section in which the people have to any large extent lost their faith. This is due to the fact that this section, more than any other part of Latin America, has been evangelized by Protestant missionaries of the United States. The people ceased to be Catholics even in name, and they did not become Protestants—but bandits!

While, then, Latin America, with this notable exception, is at least Christian, our census shows that one-half of our population does not even profess belief in Christ. While these missionaries are complaining in this country of ever-decreasing congregations, the Catholic churches in this country are filled several times every Sunday. "Physician, cure thyself."

How will these Protestant missionaries teach the Latin Americans respect for life, by our methods of suicide and lynch law? Will these missionaries find in Latin America any instances of men strung up to a tree, hanged, burned and shot to death by respectable citizens without due process of law? It may be noted, in passing, that executions of this sort are most common in the States among us that have the fewest Catholics.

Will these missionaries remove the blot of illiteracy from Latin America? Again it might be asked: Why not remain at home? The States which show the most illiteracy in the United States are: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arizona and New Mexico. Of these States only three, Louisiana, Arizona and New Mexico, have a consider-

able Catholic population, at least one hundred Catholics for 1,000 of the population. The other ten States, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee and Kentucky, comprise the sections where Catholics are less numerous than elsewhere in the United States—not ten per 1,000. So that it may be said that the illiterate section of our country is also that section in which Catholicism least abounds. Is the Catholic religion responsible for this? (See "*Special Reports of the Bureau of the Census*"—*Religious Bodies*—vol. I, p. 64, also Chap. XII, p. 1200 of vol. I of the *Thirteenth Census Reports*.)

Will these zealous missionaries transport the morality of our home life to Latin America? We had in the United States in 1906 one divorce for every twelve marriages. During 1901, among 75,000,000 Americans, there were twice as many divorces as among the 400,000,000 Christians in the rest of the world. We rank next to Japan in legalized immorality in the home. From 1807 to 1906 the increase in divorces has been thirty per cent. every five years. Since 1830 the population has increased eight-fold, while divorces have increased eighty fold. Over 110,000 divorces were granted in 1914. Ninety thousand orphans were created by divorce last year. Of the divorces granted to women, one-third were for desertion, and only five per cent. for drunkenness. How far the Catholic Church is responsible for this may be seen from the report of the Commissioner of Labor, a Protestant, who compiled these divorce statistics in 1886. He says on page 112:

Large and increasing as the number of divorces in the United States is, it is an undeniable fact that were it not for the widespread influence of the Roman Catholic Church, the num-

ber would be much greater. The loyalty of Catholics to the teachings and doctrines of their Church, and the fact that one of the cardinal doctrines of the Church is that Christian marriage is a holy Sacrament, which, when consummated, can be dissolved for no cause and in no manner save by death, has unquestionably served as a barrier to the volume of divorce which, except among members of that Church, is and during the past twenty years has been assuming ever-increasing proportions throughout the country.

Again we ask: Will these missionaries carry prohibition into Latin America? Alas! Before teaching prohibition they will have to prove its need by introducing our American vice of drunkenness. Intoxication seems to thrive under the influence of the English language, but it is hardly known in Latin nations.

There is one thing, however, which these missionaries can boast of. We are the richest nation on earth. I refrain from asking whether Christ came to teach money-getting, but I suggest that, instead of boasting, we should rather apologize for our wealth, when it is remembered that our distinction is purchased by blood-money.

If we mention only the faults of our country it is not because we are unmindful of its virtues. It is because we love it above the nations of the world, that we resent the Pharisaical and un-American methods of those who draw attention from our own wants to the fancied needs of foreign peoples. The information herein quoted from unprejudiced sources, in reference to illiteracy and divorce, will not deter bigots from slanderizing the Church, but it will appeal to people of fair minds. We cannot expect the world to take us for its mentor and physician, until we have made honest and successful efforts to eradicate the evils peculiarly our own, and which cannot but prove a source of regret to Americans possessed of the spirit of Christians and patriots.

The Gospel of Humanity

BY M. P. HAYNE, M.A.

TOO many graduates of State universities draw from their courses in political economy and sociology, an unsafe scheme of life, to serve as their guide in the practical world. It is the "gospel of humanity," preached to them by radical professors who assume, as a matter of course, that all that is old is "reactionary" and bad. One hears a great deal in these courses about the supreme importance of material progress, and the gradual evolution of the race from the darkness of intellectual bondage and superstition. The divine nature of man is a cardinal dogma, and many references are made, *en passant*, to "worn-out creeds that no thinking person of today can accept."

Such statements, stressed by plausible talkers, appeal to the impressionable mind of youth, eager to learn the latest thought, and to be considered fully "up-to-date." One is never so impatient of restraint as during the college years; and it is small wonder that callow students who attend such courses and discussions often suffer a loss of faith, never to recover that faith in after life. "What is the use of bothering about an improbable hereafter, which we do not know anything about?" these apt pupils say. "The only immortality that is real, is the good that we do on earth. Is not a life devoted to furthering the progress of humanity for humanity's sake, a progress that consists of the happiness of material com-

forts and well-being, infinitely more unselfish than the life of a believer, who is filled with solicitude for the welfare of his own soul, and who does good deeds with the idea of some future reward? The race is immortal, not the individual; and as for sin, it is an offense not against God, but against the self-respect of a divine humanity."

The college graduate who goes out to battle with the world, arrayed in the armor of such a code, will find it unavailing against the pitiless onslaught of temptation. There are hours when only an overwhelming appreciation of the value of the human soul and a deep sense of the responsibility of the individual to God, can guide to safety. Mere devotion to "humanity," or even a keen sense of "self-respect" will not suffice; for such ideals founded on materialism, will, if carried to a logical conclusion, crush out the finer spiritual sense of the individual who adopts them. This is an age when the difference between right and wrong is shaded. There is much talk of the rights of man, little of his duties. "Right" and "wrong" are considered mere points of view.

One hears much of the sins of society, little of the sins of the individual; for sin is thought a disease, the responsibility for which should be laid at the doors of organized society. In times of lessened individual responsibility, one would wish for more of the moral backbone of Puritan days, when black was black and white, white. The graduate, hearing everything excused, finishes by excusing himself. Cardinal Newman, who saw the birth of the gospel of humanitarianism, and the doctrine which substitutes self-respect for conscience, discusses its essential superficiality and its logical effect upon its followers in his "Knowledge and Religious Duty." "If the principle which determines what is vir-

tuous is not conscience, but taste," he says, "it would be natural to suppose that what looks fair will be good, what causes offense will be evil; virtue will be what pleases, vice what pains." Thus, "that very refinement of intellectualism, which began by repelling sensuality, ends by excusing it."

The young man or woman who carries the standard of humanitarianism into the field of social service will be found at a disadvantage with the Catholic worker. Religion is the mother of charity. For centuries the Catholic spirit has been teaching the world the lessons of genuine social service. The labor in the Master's vineyard has been twofold; for souls are to be saved, as well as bodies. Today an ungrateful world is trying to separate religion and charity to make the latter, degenerated into mere materialism, the slave of the State. Will the humanitarian worker succeed as well as the earnest Catholic; the humanitarian, who lacks the spirit of prayer which alone preserves humility and tolerance, and a sense of true values? The modern type of worker, to whom the material progress of a soulless creation is everything, will have no message of hope to broken and shattered lives, for he knows nothing of a merciful God, nothing of a Saviour, nothing of the tender and intimate relation between Creator and creature.

Improve external conditions certainly; but even then the best part of the work still remains undone, for a materially contented race does not mean a moral race. Frederick Ozanam, the founder of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, distinguishes between the help that honors, and the help that humbles those who receive it. Material aid alone is apt to be humiliating; it is honorable when it may be mutual. "Because every man who gives

a kind word, good advice, consolation, today, may tomorrow stand in need of like consolation . . . because that indigent family whom you love, loves you in return, and will have largely acquitted themselves toward you when the old man, the mother, the little children shall have prayed for you." Only he who has faith, a consciousness of the infinite value of the individual soul, and the spirit of Christian humility, can succeed with Christ's poor.

The doctrine of the "divinity of the race," as Canon Sheehan's Irish priest puts it, "makes gods out of a few wretched bipeds who eat carrion, and drink Oriental drugs to keep the wretched life in them, and clothe themselves in unlovely garments by night, and snore unto the stars!" The human race is as perishable as the individual, and humanity is no more eternal than is this planet. Ours is a comparatively young world. Science tells us that conditions will arise to make human life on this earth impossible, when there will be a dead earth and an exhausted sun. Then what has become of divine humanity? It turns out to be a tale signifying nothing. The denial of personal immortality, considered even aside from the question of faith, is irrational because it violates the eternal law of progress, and renders human existence purposeless, the meaningless product of blind chance. Thus the gospel of humanity, stripped of its high-sounding phrases and drawn to its natural conclusion, means "nothingness." But it is to this hopeless and dreary code of words that some of our young Catholic men and women have sacrificed the precious gift of their Faith.